

## COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on June 13, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-21 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1, 3-11, 13-14, 16-18 and 20-21; 2) added new claims 22 and 23; and 3) canceled no claims. As such, claims 1-23 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20020129140 by Peled et al. (hereinafter Peled).

Peled discloses a system for network content monitoring and control. (Peled, Abstract.) Figure 1 illustrates "a simplified" "conceptual view of a system for detection of transport of unauthorized content." (Peled, paragraph 0166.) When an incoming transport reaches an inspection point, one or more binary signatures are extracted from an individual packet of the transport. (Peled, paragraph 0166. Emphasis added.) The extracted signature is compared to previously extracted illegal content signatures. (Peled, paragraph 0169.) Results of this comparison are input to an

unauthorized content detection subsystem “where an accumulated number of matches may be used to decided if the packets comprise illegal digital content.” (Peled, paragraph 0169.) “Alternatively a quantitative measure, or an accumulation of quantitative measures of each match may be used.” (Peled, paragraph 0169.)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Peled under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Peled does not disclose:

A computer-implemented method comprising:  
maintaining a plurality of stored signatures in a data storage device, each signature being associated with one of a plurality of registered documents;  
intercepting packets being transmitted over a network;  
reassembling the packets into an intercepted document;  
calculating a set of signatures associated with the intercepted document; and  
comparing the set of signatures associated with the intercepted document with the plurality of stored signatures to determine if the intercepted document contains content associated with a registered document

Peled does not describe reassembling packets into a document. Nor does Peled describe calculating a set of signatures for a complete document. Nor does Peled describe comparing a set of signatures for a complete document to a set of stored signatures. Rather, as described above, Peled discloses calculating a signature for each packet it receives. (Peled, paragraph 0166.) From a collection of these signatures a guess as to if the packet was a part of an unauthorized transaction is made. (Peled,

paragraphs, 0169 and 0174-5.) Accordingly, Peled does not describe what Applicants' claim 1 requires. Claims 2-7 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is not anticipated by Peled under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Peled does not disclose:

An apparatus comprising:  
a network interface module to connect the apparatus to a network;  
a signature database to store a first set of signatures, the first set of signatures being associated with a registered object;  
an object capture module to intercept packets being transmitted over the network;  
an object assembly module to reassemble the packets into an intercepted object; and  
a registration module comprising a registration engine to generate a second set of signatures, the second set of signatures being associated with the intercepted object, and a search engine to compare the second set of signatures with the first set of signatures.

Peled does not describe reassembling packets into a object let alone an object assembly module to reassemble the packets into an intercepted object. Nor does Peled describe a module to generate a set of signatures for a complete object. Nor does Peled describe a search engine to compare a set of signatures for a complete object to a set of stored signatures. Rather, as described above, Peled discloses calculating a signature for each packet it receives. (Peled, paragraph 0166.) From a collection of these signatures a guess as to if the packet was a part of an unauthorized transaction is made.

(Peled, paragraphs, 0169 and 0174-5.) Accordingly, Peled does not describe what Applicants' claim 8 requires. Claims 9-15 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is not anticipated by Peled under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Peled does not disclose:

A machine-readable medium storing a sequence of instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:

maintaining a plurality of stored signatures in a data storage device, each signature being associated with one of a plurality of registered objects;

intercepting packets being transmitted over a network;

reassembling the packets into an intercepted object;

calculating a set of signatures associated with the intercepted object; and

comparing the set of signatures associated with the intercepted object with the plurality of stored signatures to determine if the intercepted document contains content associated with a registered document.

Peled does not describe reassembling packets into an object. Nor does Peled describe calculating a set of signatures for a complete object. Nor does Peled describe comparing a set of signatures for a complete object to a set of stored signatures. Rather, as described above, Peled discloses calculating a signature for each packet it receives. (Peled, paragraph 0166.) From a collection of these signatures a guess as to if the

packet was a part of an unauthorized transaction is made. (Peled, paragraphs, 0169 and 0174-5.) Accordingly, Peled does not describe what Applicants' claim 16 requires. Claims 17-21 are dependent on claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reason.

### Comments

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Ryan W. Elliott at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 11/13/07



Ryan W. Elliott  
Reg. No. 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300